DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 471 CG 017 021

AUTHOR Prager, Karen J.
TITLE Intimacy Status and Self-Disclosure to Significant Others and Strangers.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, Montreal, Canada, April 11-14, 1983). For related document, see ED 221 804.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Confidentiality; *Congruence (Psychology); Developmental Stages; Higher Education; Interpersonal Attraction; *Interpersonal Communication; *Interpersonal Relationship; Marriage; Psychological Characteristics; Rapport; Self Actualization; *Self Disclosure (Individuals); *Significant Others; Social Cognition
IDENTIFIERS *Intimacy; Jourard Self Disclosure Inventory

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to explore the relationship between self-disclosure and intimacy status. Sixty-four women and 32 men (mean age = 27.44) were asked to complete the Greene Self-Disclosure Sentence Blank in response to one of two conditions, each of which specified a hypothetical target person for the self-revealing communication: a Significant Other (with whom the subject was close) or a Stranger (a new acquantance). Subjects also completed the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire, which assessed previous self-disclosing behavior, and responded to an interview, which allowed them to be placed into one of six possible intimacy statuses: Intimate, Merger, Preintimate, Pseudointimate, Stereotyped Relationships, or Isolate. Amount of previous self-disclosure to a romantic partner varied significantly as a function of intimacy status, marital status and sex, with the greatest amounts of personal information having been communicated by those in the intimate, married, and female groups, respectively. Previous self-disclosure to a closest friend varied with the subjects' martial status and sex, with divorced and female subjects having disclosed the most. Subjects assigned to the Significant Other condition disclosed more intimate information than those assigned to the Stranger condition. Intimacy status, marital status and sex did not affect the intimacy level nor the self-evaluative content of the disclosures observed in the experimental situation. It was concluded that intimacy development most likely has an impact on overall patterns of self-disclosure in romantic relationships; however, its relationship to behavior in a particular situation has not yet been demonstrated. The subjects' relationship with the recipient of communication appears to be critical in determining the level of self-disclosure. (Author/BL)

ED236471

INTIMACY STATUS AND SELF-DISCLOSURE TO SIGNIFICANT OTHERS AND STRANGERS

Karen J. Prager

The University of Texas at Dallas

Presented at the Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April, 1983

CG 017021

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karen J. Prager

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

Sixty-four women and 32 men (mean age = 27.44) were asked to complete the Greene Self-Disclosure Sentence Blank in response to one of two conditions, each of which specified a hypothetical target person for the self-revealing communication: a Significant Other (with whom the subject was close) or a Stranger (a new acquaintance). Subjects also completed the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire, which assessed previous self-disclosing behavior, and responded to an interview, which allowed them to be placed into one of six possible intimacy statuses: Intimate, Merger, Pre-intimate, Pseudointimate, Stereotyped Relationships, or Isolate. Amount of previous self-disclosure to a romantic partner varied significantly as a function of intimacy status, marital status and sex, with the greatest amounts of personal information having been communicated by those in the Intimate, married, and female groups, respectively. Previous self-disclosure to a closest friend varied with the subjects' marital status and sex, with divorced and female subjects having disclosed the most. Subjects assigned to the Significant Other condition disclosed more intimate information than those assigned to the Stranger condition. Intimacy status, marital status and sex did not affect the intimacy level nor the self-evaluative content of the disclosures observed in the experimental situation. It was concluded that intimacy development most likely has an impact on overall patterns of self-disclosure in romantic relationships; however, its relationship to behavior in a particular situation has not yet been demonstrated. The subject's relationship with the recipient of communication appears to be crucial in determining the level of disclosing he or she is willing to make.

INTIMACY STATUS AND SELF-DISCLOSURE

TO SIGNIFICANT OTHERS AND STRANGERS

Self-disclosure, or the verbal sharing of private facts and personal feelings, has been found to vary both as a function of individual factors, such as gender (cf. Chelune, 1979), self-concept (Shapiro & Swensen, 1977), need for approval (Brundage, Derlega & Cash, 1977; Prager, 1982) and trait anxiety (Post, Wittmaier & Radin, 1978) and as a function of situational factors, such as the discloser's level of acquaintance with the recipient (Brown & Helms, 1981; Morton, 1978; Stokes, Fuehrer & Childs, 1980; Winum, Banikotes & Neimeyer, 1981) the physical surroundings (Chaikin, Derlega & Miller, 1976; Winum, et al., 1981), the attractiveness of the recipient (Brundage, et al., 1977) and the level of self-disclosure reciprocated (cf. Cozby, 1973). Reviewers, such as Cozby (1973) and Chelune (1979), have recommended that insights into the prediction of self-disclosing behavior can be gained only from the simultaneous assessment of both individual and situational factors, in order that the nature of the interactions between these factors be better understood.

It has been suggested that one's willingness to open up in both social and therapeutic relationships is a function of psychological development (Brown & Helms, 1981; Tiedeman, 1980). Specifically, one would expect that the nature of one's resolution to the developmental crisis of intimacy vs. isolation, described by Erikson (1963) as the paramount developmental challenge of young adulthood, would determine one's willingness and capacity to openly share innermost thoughts and feelings with another. According to

Erikson (1963; 1968), an individual's capacity for intimacy is a function of his/her resolution of this crisis. This capacity is composed of a willingness to make a commitment to a relationship, and also implies depth: the ability to be open, accessible, emotionally and physically close, and respectful of another's differences from oneself (Erikson, 1959; 1963; Whitbourne & Weinstock, 1979). Six intimacy statuses, each representing different resolutions to this crisis, as well as different levels of the capacity for intimacy, have been identified and validated, based on the two dimensions of depth and commitment (Orlofsky, 1976; Orlofsky, Marcia & Lesser, 1973). The six statuses are: Intimate--in which the person has (or has had) a relationship characterized by depth and commitment; Isolate--in which the person has few, if any, social relationships, and shares little of him or herself with anyone; Stereotyped Relationships--in which a person has social relationships, but these are superficial, utilitarian and uncommitted; Preintimate--in which a person has deep, close relationships, but none of these is committed; Pseudointimate--in which a person has made a commitment to a primary relationship but the relationship lacks depth; and Merger--in which a person has committed to a close, primary relationship, but this relationship has an unequal balance of power, and no room for the expression of individuality in the partners. A number of studies have supported the validity of the intimacy status construct (Orlofsky, 1976; Orlofsky & Ginsburg, 1980; Orlofsky, et al., 1973; Prager, in press; Tesch & Whitbourne, 1982).

Based on the recommendations of Cozby (1973) and Chelune (1979), an understanding of the impact of intimacy development on self-disclosure

would best be gained by studying these variables within a situational context. Knowledge of an individual's self-disclosing behavior with one person has not proved to be a strong predictor of self-disclosure with another. Altman and Taylor (1973), in their social penetration theory, hypothesize that the intimacy level of self-disclosing communication will increase as a function of the level of acquaintance between the discloser and the recipient, and there is considerable research support for their contention (e.g. Gitter & Black, 1976; Morton, 1978; Owen & Prager, 1982; Rubin & Shenker, 1978; Stokes, et al., 1980). Indeed, intimacy development might reasonably be expected to affect self-disclosure in the context of close relationships, but to have little or no impact on the acquaintance process that occurs between two relative strangers. Erikson (1963) speculated that the outcome of unsuccessful intimacy development might be an inability to maintain relationships beyond the level of superficial acquaintance, thereby suggesting that resolving the intimacy crisis may not be necessary for this level of interaction.

The objective of the present study was to explore the relationship between self-disclosure and intimacy status. The current work proposed to improve on previous research in self-disclosure by first, examining the combined effects of an individual (intimacy development) and a situational (relationship with the recipient) variable within one study. Second, in acknowledgement of Chelune's finding that "the diversity of methods and assessment techniques...probably contributes to some of the contradictory findings in the self-disclosure literature (1979, p. 3),

the present work assessed self-disclosure in several ways. Given that self-report inventories measuring past patterns of communication, such as the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (JSDQ) (Jourard & Lasako, 1958) have been found to be minimally correlated with ratings of actual self-disclosure in experimental situations (e.g. Carpenter & Freese, 1979), both types of measures were used here. In addition, actual self-disclosure has been found to consist of several dimensions (Chelune, 1978): 1) amount, or breadth of personal information disclosed, 2) intimacy of the information revealed, 3) duration or rate of disclosure, 4) affective manner of presentation, and 5) the positive-negative self-evaluative aspect of the disclosure. To avoid the tendency of some investigators to "make unqualified statements about differences in self-disclosure... based solely on undimensional assessment measures (Chelune, 1979, p. 7), three of these dimensions were measured in the current work: amount (an objective method used by Pederson & Briglio, 1968), intimacy level and the positive-negative self-evaluative aspects of the disclosures (observational methods requiring raters' subjective judgements). Actual self-disclosure was measured by the Greene Self-Disclosure Sentence Blank (SDSB) (Greene, 1971), an instrument which has been shown to have concurrent and construct validity (Carpenter, 1977; Lawless & Nowicki, 1972; Greene, 1971).

Finally, this study further refined an initial investigation conducted by this author (Prager, 1982), in that the relationship between intimacy status and self-disclosure was viewed in the contexts of communication with both a new acquaintance and the subjects' closest sig-

nificant others. It was hypothesized that placement in the Intimate and Preintimate (or high depth) statuses would be predictive of higher levels of reported past disclosures to significant others. Intimate and Preintimate subjects were also expected to disclose in greater amounts, and at higher intimacy levels, than Pseudointimate, Stereotyped and Isolated subjects. No predictions were made regarding the positive-negative self-evaluative aspects of the disclosures.

Method

Subjects. Sixty-four women and 32 men attending a state university in the southwest participated in the study to satisfy a psychology course requirement. The young adult sample ranged in age from 20 to 40, with a mean age of 27. Forty-one per cent were married or remarried, 38% were never married, 15% were separated or divorced, and 7% were living with a nonmarital partner.

Procedure. Twenty-six subjects were assigned to the Stranger condition while 70 were assigned to the Significant Other condition (a larger number was assigned to the latter condition in order that the multiple variables associated with the Significant Other, such as the nature of the relationship, the frequency of contact, the level of closeness, and the length of the relationship could be reliably assessed as potential predictors of self-disclosure.) Instructions for the Stranger condition were as follows:

"Imagine yourself in the following situation: You have just started a new semester at school and are waiting for your first class to begin. You get to talking to the person next to you, who is the same sex as you.

He/she suggests that you have lunch together after class, and you accept. You decide to go off campus, and find a very pleasant, quiet place where you can relax, take your time and enjoy some conversation with your new acquaintance."

Instructions for the Significant Other condition were:

"Think for a moment of the one person (adult) to whom you feel closest of everyone you know and write his or her initials in the space below. If there is more than one person to whom you feel equally close, pick one of those people and write his or her initials in the space below. If there is no one in particular to whom you feel close, pick someone you see often, e.g. at work. Imagine yourself now in the following situation: you and the person whose initials you listed have just finished a quiet dinner for two and are settling in with coffee for a couple of hours of conversation."

Participants then completed the Green Self-Disclosure Sentence Blank (SDSB) in response to the above instructions, followed by the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (JSDQ). For the latter, they were instructed to complete it twice--first, with their romantic partner in mind and second for their closest friend. Those who did not have a current romantic partner or closest friend were instructed to leave that part of their answer sheet blank. Completion of the questionnaire took 30 minutes. Following completion, participants signed up for a separate intimacy status interview session scheduled 1 to 2 weeks following the questionnaire session.

Instruments. Intimacy status was determined by means of a 30-minute

tape-recorded semi-structured interview. The scoring manual for adults (Tesch & Whitbourne, 1982), adapted from the original constructed by Orlofsky, Marcia & Lesser (1973) was used for this study. The interview focused on the practical, emotional and sexual aspects of the subject's closest relationship. If the subject was not involved in a close friendship or romantic relationship, the interview dealt with his or her feeling about social activity in general.

If participants involved in an enduring romantic relationship said that they felt closer to another friend, both relationships were rated. When participants were not involved in enduring romantic relationships, both dating relationships and friendships were rated. When these two ratings differed for an individual, the rating for the dating relationships was used in the data analysis. Participants were placed into one of the six intimacy statuses described above: Intimate, Preintimate, Merger, Pseudointimate, Stereotyped Relationships, and Isolate. Three senior-level psychology majors were trained by the author to conduct the interviews and make the intimacy status ratings.

To determine interrated reliability, each of 36 interview tapes were cross-rated by the author and a graduate assistant. This procedure resulted in three ratings per tape. Agreement by two out of three ratings was used as the criterion for determining the intimacy status rating used in the data analysis. Three out of three raters agreed on their rating for 83% of the tapes, two out of three reached agreement for 89%.

The Greene Self-Disclosure Sentence Blank (SDSB) (Greene, 1971) consisted of 20 incomplete sentence cues, such as "My biggest problem is...",

"I am afraid...", and "I am hurt when..." which are designed to elicit feelings about personally important material. First, each item was scored by a rater on a 1-5 scale for intimacy level using the scoring manual developed by Greene (1971). The item scores were summed to yield a total intimacy level score, for which low scores indicated high levels of intimacy of self-disclosure content. Second, the amount of self-disclosure was determined by counting the number of words used by the subject (see Chelune, 1978). Last, positive-negative self-evaluations were rated on a 1-5 scale on which '1'="Very positive", '3'="Neutral", and '5'="Very negative." All ratings were made by two trained undergraduates, (different raters were used for each set of ratings, who were blind to the other ratings that had been made). Twenty-five of the questionnaires were cross-rated for each of the three ratings to determine interrater agreement, which were 80% (intimacy level); 98% (amount); and 76% (evaluative).

The Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (JSDQ) (Jourard & Resnick, 1978) contained a list of 60 topics varying in intimacy, such as feelings about one's chosen career, one's body, and one's finances. Participants were asked to indicate how much they had spoken about each topic with their romantic partner and closest friend, respectively, on a 1-3 scale, with '3' indicating they had disclosed extensively, '2' indicating they had disclosed moderately, and '1' indicating they had not disclosed about the particular topic. The total scores were summations of the ratings for the individual items, resulting in two JSDQ total scores, one for each target person.

Results

The proportions of participants classified into each of the intimacy statuses were 43 (44.8%) Intimate, 15 (15.6%) Merger, 15 (15.6%) Pre-intimate, 11 (11.5%) Pseudointimate, 7 (7.3%) in Stereotyped Relationships, and 3 (3.1%) Isolated. Two subjects did not complete the intimacy interview. Because of their small number, the Isolated subjects were dropped from further analysis. Because of the large number of Intimate women that were sampled (n=35), due most likely to the large number of Intimate status individuals that have been found among adult samples, a subsample of 15 Intimate women was randomly selected from this group for use in the data analysis.

Means and standard deviations for the three SDSB ratings were computed for the two target conditions. The mean intimacy level of disclosure was significantly higher in the Significant Other condition ($M=48.34$, $S.D.=12.81$) than in the Stranger condition ($M=54.03$, $S.D.=13.02$) with $T=2.72$, $p<.005$. Based on this result, it was concluded that the two hypothetical target conditions were viewed differently by the study participants.

Intercorrelations among the five dependent self-disclosure measures are shown in Table 1. The low correlations between the self-report and observational measures are consistent with results from other studies (Carpenter & Freese, 1979). Correlations among the observational measures indicate that those who disclosed more intimate information also used more words ($r=0.53$, $p<.01$) and revealed more negative content ($r=0.41$, $p<.01$). Those who disclosed more negative information also used more words

($r=0.27$, $p<.01$). The size of these intercorrelations was considered sufficient to warrant use of MANOVA procedures for analyzing differences between groups.

Next, given that participants selected their own "significant other" for the experimental condition, the question was explored as to whether the levels of self-disclosure found in this condition were affected by the nature of the relationship between the subject and his/her significant other, the length of the relationship, the frequency with which they saw each other and the level of closeness between them (rated by the subject on a 1-5 scale). Three one-way analyses of variance were conducted to test for mean differences in intimacy level, amount and positive-negative content of self-disclosure among subjects who selected spouse, lover, friend, relative, etc. as the target of their disclosures. No differences were found among the groups. This finding may reflect the instructions, which requested that subjects select the person to whom they felt the closest. Spearman correlation coefficients were computed for the three self-disclosure ratings and the length, closeness and frequency of encounter ratings. Of these nine correlations, only two were significant at $p=.05$; both were with length of relationship, which correlated with intimacy level at $\rho=0.24$ and positive-negative content at $\rho=-0.28$. These results indicate that those who had known their target person longer disclosed more intimate and more positive information, confirming social penetration theory (Altman & Taylor, 1973), which predicted that intimacy level of communication in a relationship should increase over time.

The overall hypothesis of the current study, that both self-reported

and observed self-disclosure would vary as a function of the participants' intimacy status, was tested via a 6 (intimacy status) x 3 (marital status) x 2 (condition: Stranger vs. Significant Other) x 2 (sex) MANOVA with the five measures of self-disclosure dependent. Marital status was divided into three groups: single (those who had never married, although they might be in a steady relationship), married (both first-timers and remarried subjects) and a divorced group (which also included those who were separated). There were no widows in the sample. Means and standard deviations on all dependent variables for each intimacy status, marital status, sex and condition are shown in Table 2. Because of uneven cell sizes, harmonic means were used in the analysis. Results for the JSDQ, with "lover" and "closest friend" as the target persons will be reported first. JSDQ-"lover" scores varied significantly as a function of intimacy status ($F_{4,45}$= 6.77, $p<.001$), marital status ($F_{2,45}$=7.33, $p<.01$), and sex ($F_{1,45}$=20.31, $p<.001$). Interactions for marital status x sex ($F_{2,45}$=4.40, $p<.05$) and condition x sex ($F_{1,45}$=6.82, $p<.05$) were also significant. Duncan's multiple range test for the main effects indicated that, as expected, Intimate subjects (M=104.77) reported disclosing more to their lovers than Pseudointimate (M=85.00) and Stereotyped subjects (M=69.33). Preintimate (M=95.80), Merger (M=94.20) and Pseudointimate subjects had also disclosed more than those in the Stereotyped status. Married subjects (M=102.14) had disclosed more than single (M=88.61) or divorced (M=88.00) subjects and females (M=102.36) had disclosed more than males (M=85.33). The marital status x sex interaction suggested that the sex difference in disclosure did not hold for married subjects (males: M=103.00, females: M=102.38) but rather only

for single (males: M=80.80, females: M=98,38) and divorced subjects (males: M-65.75, females: M=110.25). The sex x condition interaction showed that the males who had been placed in the Significant Other condition (M=89.00) had higher JSDQ-Lover scores than those placed in the Stranger condition (M=69.50).

The intimacy statuses did not differentiate among JSDQ scores when "closest friend" was the target. However, significant main effects were found for marital status ($F_{2,45}$=6.17, $p<.01$), sex ($F_{1,45}$=9.92, $p<.01$), and an interaction effect was found for sex x condition ($F_{1,45}$=9.53, $p<.01$). Duncan's multiple range test showed divorced subjects (M=101.80) had disclosed more to their closest friends than single (M=80.91) or married (M=72.78) subjects, and that females (M=86.41) had disclosed more than males (M=70.10). The sex x condition interaction in this case reflected the fact that women placed in the significant other condition (M=93.50) had higher JSDQ scores than women in the Stranger condition, while for men the pattern was reversed (Significant Other: M=66.93, Stranger: M=85.75).

Although the overall ANOVA for intimacy status was not significant, it is interesting to note that the Duncan test showed the mean JSDQ-"Friend" score (M=63.57) for those in the Merger status was significantly lower than the other statuses'. Given that those in the Merger group are by definition restricted in their relationships outside of their primary one, this finding was considered theoretically consistant.

For intimacy level of self-disclosure, the main effect for condition was significant, as reported earlier. The predicted main effects for

intimacy status, as well as the intimacy status x condition interactions were not observed. No significant effects were found for the positive-negative content or amount of self-disclosure measures.

Discussion

Self-report measures

The hypothesis that individuals in the various intimacy statuses could be differentiated on the basis of their self-disclosing behavior was partially supported by the results of the present study. Intimate status participants reported that they had disclosed more personal information on a broader range of topics, as assessed via the JSDQ, to their romantic partners than those in the Pseudointimate and Stereotyped groups. Those in the Stereotyped group had disclosed less than any of the other groups. These results indicate, then, that one's willingness to verbally share a broad range of private information and feelings to one's romantic partner is most likely associated with one's developed capacity for intimacy, a capacity which emerges as a consequence of coping with the intimacy crisis. Indeed, a willingness to open up may be one consequence of the successful resolution of the intimacy crisis. Although Erikson's writing on intimacy focuses principally upon its physical aspects (1968), more recent research has indicated that verbal self-disclosure is viewed as the central component of intimacy by the general population (Waring, McElrath, Mitchell & Derry, 1981).

The association between intimacy status and self-disclosure was not significant when the recipient was the participant's closest friend.

This may be due to the fact that the intimacy status rating is heavily weighted toward romantic relationships. However, in a prior study (Prager, 1982) a separate Friendship intimacy status rating was not associated with observed self-disclosure. Previous research has indicated that people expect their romantic relationships to be their most intimate (Safilios-Rothchild, 1981; Skolnick, 1978; Waring, et al., 1981) and disclose more of themselves in these relationships (Jourard, 1981; Jourard & Lasako, 1958; Hacker, 1981; Waring, 1980). Maintaining intimate romantic partnerships may demand higher levels of psychological development than friendship formation; Sullivan (1953) noted that close same-sex friendships were often formed as early as late childhood. Intimacy development in adulthood may therefore primarily affect self-disclosure in the context of a romantic relationship.

It should be noted that the lower JSDQ-Friend scores of those involved in Merger relationships supports the notion that some romantic involvements can restrict the expression of individuality in the partners, in this case, perhaps, the development of open, sharing outside relationships. Since those in Merger couples tend to be very dependent upon one another, the finding that individuals in these relationships share less with their friends is consistent with the overall definition of this status.

Married subjects in the present study had disclosed more to their romantic partners than single or divorced subjects, while the latter two groups had disclosed more to their closest friends than those who were married. Marital status may then be an important variable in determining to whom one discloses, while not being relevant in predicting an in-

dividual's overall willingness to self-disclose. Perhaps, when a romantic partner is consistently and frequently available, as is usually the case with married people, more self-disclosure occurs with him or her. When the romantic partner is less available or when there is no current romantic partner, more disclosure may occur with friends. Conversely, marital demands may result in one's having less time and energy to devote to friendships, and thus may be a limiting factor in one's access to friendships and in the depth that these relationships may reach.

Observational measures

The higher levels of intimacy found in the disclosures to the Significant Others, compared with the information shared with the Strangers, confirmed the findings of earlier studies in which people disclosed more intimate material to a significant other than to a stranger, the "stranger-on-the-train" phenomenon notwithstanding (Brown & Helms, 1981; Morton, 1978; Owen & Prager, 1982). No differences were found in the amount of information shared nor in the positive-negative content of the disclosures as a function of the target person, however. The fact that amount of self-disclosure did not vary with any of the factors explored in this study may be a function of problems inherent in assessing self-disclosure by counting the words in a given communication. This method has the advantage of being a totally objective measure; however, it may not represent a sufficiently meaningful aspect of self-disclosure to be useful. Social penetration theory, which asserts that the intimacy level of information exchanged is greater in established relationships, was supported here. Additionally,

the notion that the information exchanged is likely to increase in intimacy and in positiveness as that relationship lengthens was also supported.

The observed self-disclosure in this experiment did not vary as a function of the two individual variables: intimacy status and sex. Chelune (1979) has commented that behavioral measures of self-disclosure may assess situation-specific responses rather than typical examples of participants' self-disclosing behavior with their significant others. The present results serve to underscore the notion that the diversity of findings with respect to self-disclosure is due in part to the fact that most studies use only one dimension of this behavior, and that these various dimensions do not necessarily respond to situations in parallel fashion. The JSDQ and other self-report measures generally reflect an individual's history of self-disclosing to particular people and therefore, may assess something more like a personality trait, i.e. a general tendency which is observable across situations. This "trait" then would be more likely to be associated with other "trait-type" factors (e.g. developmental status, sex) while observational measures may more frequently change as a function of situational factors (e.g. target person characteristics). Chelune (1979) predicted that studies examining multiple dimensions and multiple determiners of self-revealing behavior would uncover the ways in which individual and situational factors interact in influencing behavior. The present study indicates that these two types of factors may have different effects, or no effect at all, depending upon which dimension has been examined.

References

Altman, I. and Taylor, D.A. Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.

Brown, M.T. & Helms, J. E. The relationship between psychological development issues and anticipated self-disclosure to various stimulus persons. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA, 1981.

Brundage, L. E. Derlega, V.J. & Cash, J. F. The effects of physical attractiveness and need for approval on self-disclosure. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1977, 3, (1), 63-66.

Carpenter, J. C. Personal approach: An empirical construct and some findings. J. of Personality, 1977, 45, 169-189.

Carpenter, J. C. & Freese, J. J. Three aspects of self-disclosure as they relate to quality of adjustment. J. Personality Assessment, 1979, 43, 77-85.

Chaikin, A. L., Derlega, V.J. and Miller, S. J. Effects of room environment on self-disclosure in a counseling analogue. J. Counseling Psy., 1976, 23, (5), 479-481.

Chelune, G. J. Measuring openness in interpersonal communication. In Chelune, et. al. (Eds.) Self disclosure: Origins, Patterns and Implications of Openness in Interpersonal Relationships. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Chelune, G. J. Nature and assessment of self-disclosing behavior. In P. McReynolds (Ed.) Advances in Psychological Assessment IV. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Chelune, G. J. Toward an empirical definition of self-disclosure: validation in a single case design. The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1981, 45, 269-276.

Cozby, P. C. Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 2, 73-91.

Erikson, E. Childhood and Society. New York. Norton, 1963.

Erikson, E. Identity and the life cycle. Psychological Issues, 1973, 2, 73-91.

Erikson,E. Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: Norton, 1968.

Gitter, A.G. & Black, H. Is self-disclosure self-revealing? J. of Counseling Psy., 1976, 23, (4), 327-332.

Greene, R.A. Self-disclosure and dogmatism as they relate to sensory acuity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1971.

Hacker, H. M. Blabbermouths and clams: Sex differences in self-disclosure in same- sex and cross-sex friendship dyads. Psy. of Women Quarterly, 1981, 5, (3), 385-401.

Jourard, J.M. Self-disclosure patterns in British and American college females. J. of Social Psy., 1961, 54, 315-320.

Jourard, S.M. & Lasakoro, P. Some factors in self-disclosure. J. Abnormal and Social Psy., 1958, 56, 91-98.

Jourard, J. M. & Resnick, J. L. The effect of high revealing subjects on the self-disclosure of low-revealing subjects. J. of Humanistic Psy., 1970- 10 , 84-93.

Lawless, C. L. & Nowicki, S. Role of self-disclosure in interpersonal attraction. J. Consulting and Clinical Psy., 1972, 38, (2), 300.

Morton, T. L. Intimacy and reciprocity of exchange: a comparison of spouses and strangers. J. of Personality and Social Psy., 1978, 36, (1), 72-81.

Stokes, J., Fuehrer, A. & Childs L. Gender differences in self-disclosure to various target persons. J. Counseling Psy., 1980, 27, 192-198.

Skolnick, A. The Intimate Environment: Exploring Marriage and the Family. Boston: Little, Brown, 1978.

Sullivan, H.S. The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: Norton, 1953.

Tesch, S. Whitbourne, S.K. Intimacy and identity status in young adults. J.Personality and Social Psy. 1982, 43, (5), 1041-1051.

Tiedeman, D. Counseling psychology, 2000 A.D.? The Counseling Psychologist, 1980, 8, 28-31.

Waring, E.M. Facilitating Marital intimacy through self-disclosure. The American Journal of Family Therapy, 1981, 9, (4), 33-42.

Waring, E.M. Mc Elrath, D. Mitchell, P & Derrey, M. Intimacy and emotional illness in the general population. Can. J. of Psychiatry, 1981, 26, 167-172.

Whitbourne, S.K. & Weinstock, S. Adult Development: The Differentiation of Experience New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Winum, P.C. Banikiotes, P.G. & Neimeye, G.J. The appropriateness of situational disclosures and interpersonal perceptions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA, 1981.

Orlofsky, J. L. Intimacy status: relationship to interpersonal perception. J. of Youth and Adolescence, 1976, 5, 73-88.

Orlofsky, J. L. & Ginsburg, S.D. 1980. Intimacy status: relationship to affect cognition. Adolescence, 1981, 16, 91-100.

Orlofsky, J. L. , Marcia, J. E. Lesser, I.M. Ego identity status and the intimacy versus isolation crisis of young adulthood. J. Personality and Social Psy., 1973, 27, 211-219.

Owen, D. & Prager, K. Intimacy and function of self-disclosure with strangers, friends and lovers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, Texas Psychological Association, Dallas, TX 1982.

Pederson, D.M. & Breglio, V.J. The correlation of two self-disclosure inventories with actual self-disclosure: A validity study, J. of Psychology, 1968, 68, 291-298.

Post, A. L. Wittmaier, B.C. & Radin, M.E. Self-disclosure as a function of state and trait anxiety. J. of Consulting and Clinical Psy., 1978, 46, (1), 12-19.

Prager, K. Development of intimacy in young adults: a multidimensional view. Psychological Reports, in press.

Prager, K. Intimacy status, locus of control and self-disclosure in women. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, New York, N. Y. April, 1982.

Rubin, Z., & Shenker, S. Friendship, proximity and self-disclosure. J. Personality, 1978, 46 (1), 1-22.

Safilios-Rothschild, C. Toward a social psychology of relationships. Psy. of Women Quarterly, 1981, 5, 377-384.

Shapiro, A. and Swensen, C.H. Self-disclosure as a function of self-concept in sex. J. of Personality Assessment, 1977, 41 (2), 144-149.

Table 1

Intercorrelations Among Dependent Variables

	J.S.D.Q. scores		Observed self-disclosure		
	Lover	Friend	Intimacy [1] level	Positive-[2] Negative	Amount
J.S.D.Q.-Lover		0.34*	-0.02	-0.13	0.03
J.S.D.Q.-Friend			-0.24*	0.08	0.11
Intimacy level				-0.42**	-0.53**
Positive-Negative					0.27**

[1] Lower scores equal higher intimacy levels

[2] Lower scores equal more positive information

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Table 2

Mean self-disclosure levels by intimacy status, marital status, sex and condition

		J.S.D.Q.				Observed self-disclosure					
						Intimacy level		Positive-Negative		Amount	
	N	Lover		Friend							
Intimacy Status		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Intimate	23	104.05	15.22	85.50	17.85	52.39	11.56	3.31	0.36	105.74	26.83
Merger	15	94.20	17.47	63.57	22.17	49.13	14.54	3.56	0.27	123.53	28.70
Preintimate	15	95.80	16.10	82.77	21.06	52.40	14.59	3.48	0.28	131.60	56.73
Pseudo-intimate	11	85.00	24.99	82.43	23.53	50.00	17.32	3.47	0.43	115.64	34.58
Stereotyped	7	65.50	19.94	84.00	13.03	46.71	10.69	3.48	0.28	119.33	26.10
Marital Status											
Single	36	90.73	22.42	82.32	20.84	49.72	12.96	3.49	0.29	128.73	42.25
Married	26	101.23	12.59	72.00	18.05	52.62	15.09	3.41	0.40	107.93	27.92
Divorced	11	84.22	27.63	101.80	5.89	52.09	13.02	3.37	0.30	110.70	30.53
Sex											
Male	30	83.48	24.41	70.89	20.04	51.30	13.91	3.47	0.31	118.17	41.70
Female	43	101.94	12.65	87.85	18.10	50.98	13.62	3.41	0.35	117.63	33.07
Condition											
Significant Other	49	94.75	19.87	81.10	22.96	47.92	12.95	3.44	0.33	117.90	40.42
Stranger	24	94.05	21.50	80.41	16.15	57.63	12.91	3.44	0.34	117.75	27.84
Total	73	94.69	18.09	80.85	20.01	50.77	13.80	3.44	0.33	117.85	36.51